

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8 and 10 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are currently pending in the application.

Priority

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim for priority and receipt of the foreign priority documents.

35 U.S.C. §112 and Other Claim Objections

The claims have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections and rejections under 35 USC 112. The Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned with any questions.

For example, as shown in Fig. 6, in group information 607, an allowable event number is set as 200 at network device NE02 and allowable event number 250 is notified to the management object (network device) NE03. Therefore, when a management apparatus sets an event that is forwarded to a particular network device, this information is forwarded to another network device.

35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al and Meandzija et al. Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) unpatentable over Michihisa in view of CCITT Recommendation X.734. Claims 2 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Michihisa in view of Recommendation X.734 and Novik as applied to claims 1 and 6 above and further in view of Lewis et al. These rejections are traversed as follows.

According to the present invention, a number of events or event issuance control of each network apparatus is determined independently in accordance with the ability of the management apparatus to handle the event. By determining and notifying an event number which can be issued in a managing apparatus and network device, the event number issued from the network device is within the event handling ability of the managing apparatus and the event is issued from the network device. None of the cited references disclose these features of the present invention.

Lee et al disclose determining event processing by CMIP-MPA (114) in accordance with the number of messages received from a CMIP-Device 106. However, event issuance controls is

only carried out by the MPA, which is a Platform Layer, and does not carry out control event notification from the CMIP-Device itself. Lee et al pay close attention to the MIS of the Platform Layer.

Meandzija et al disclose that an Event Processor Module 224 sets a parameter on a SNAP Manager 210 and determines whether transmission of an event is possible by Event Processor Module 224 in SNMP Agent 230. Although, as shown in Fig. 2, judgment of event possibility is grouped, with respect to the value set by the Event Processor Module 224 in the SNMP Manager 210, there is no disclosure of paying attention to the handling capability of the SNMP Manager 210.

Even if the teaching of Michihisa is combined with Novik, the combination will still not perform issuance of an event by paying attention to the capability of a managing apparatus. Novik does not disclose any means for notifying event handling capability of a managing apparatus at all. Therefore, any attempt to combine these references with the CCIPT document would still fail to create a *prima facie* case of unpatentability.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to specify that the event number issued by the network device is determined in accordance with a processing capability of the managing

apparatus and this information is transmitted to the network device. It is submitted that the pending claims patentably define the present invention over the cited art.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that the above-identified application is no in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Shrinath Malur  
Registration No. 34,663  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR  
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1120  
Date: March 8, 2004